



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

pw
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/622,093	07/16/2003	Tim D. Logan	26634-705	1053
21971	7590	05/12/2005	EXAMINER	
WILSON SONSINI GOODRICH & ROSATI 650 PAGE MILL ROAD PALO ALTO, CA 943041050				BRINEY III, WALTER F
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		2644		

DATE MAILED: 05/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/622,093	LOGAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Walter F Briney III	2644

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-108 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-108 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>16 July 2003</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. **Claims 1-4, 8, 26-31, 35, 53-58, 62, 80-85, 89, 107 and 108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Yamartino (US Patent 6,345,095).**

Claim 1 is limited to a *method of processing phone numbers*. Yamartino discloses a telephone number area code preprocessor. See Abstract. In general, the preprocessor includes means for updating a plurality of recently changed phone number components. As disclosed in column 7, lines 24-37, the producer (115) of figure 1 updates a telephone number database (120) on a periodic basis. The database includes, at least, area code information and exchange information as suggested in column 7; lines 33-35. These pieces of information correspond to a *plurality of phone number components*. The update process must override these components either holistically or on a piece-by-piece basis, such as scanning the component to determine if it is outdated before updating. In either case, it is inherent that each updated area code and exchange number must be received from an update source and stored in a corresponding area code or exchange number field within database (120). In order to ensure proper updating, the received components must be indexed so that they

override their respective old components; this corresponds to *parsing*. The updating corresponds to correcting one or more of the stored phone numbers, and is clearly achieved before retrieval by a calling party (180). Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 28, 55, and 82 are essentially the same as claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 2 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Yamartino. Yamartino discloses that the database (120) stores at least area codes. See column 7, lines 33-35. Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 29, 56, and 83 are essentially the same as claim 2, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 3 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Yamartino. Yamartino discloses that a calling party (180) is operable to select one of the numbers stored in database (120) for subsequent generation by initiator (185). See column 10, lines 31-49. Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 30, 57, and 84 are essentially the same as claim 3, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 4 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Yamartino. Yamartino discloses detecting *undialable phone numbers*, by comparing a range of valid subscriber extensions associated with a particular exchange to the user entered subscriber extension. See column 7, line 57, through column 8, line 4. The user is

informed of the mistake so that it can be rectified. See column 7, lines 54-56.

Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 31, 58, and 85 are essentially the same as claim 4, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 8 is limited to *the method of claim 4*, as covered by Yamartino. As shown in the rejection of claim 4, invalid subscriber extensions are identified by the system of Yamartino and made known to the dialing user. It follows that the dialed number is rendered dialable upon the user removing the incorrect extension and *adding* the correct extension. Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 35, 62, and 89 are essentially the same as claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 26 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Yamartino. As shown in the rejection of claim 1, Yamartino discloses updating area codes stored within a database (120) such that an *area code update* corrects a stored number of the database. See column 7, lines 24-37. Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 53, 80, and 107 are essentially the same as claim 26, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 27 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Yamartino. As shown in the rejection of claim 1, Yamartino discloses updating area codes stored within a database (120) such that an area code update corrects a stored number of the database, where area codes are directly associated with the *geography associated with*

one or more stored telephones. See column 7, lines 24-37. Therefore, Yamartino anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 54, 81, and 108 are essentially the same as claim 27, and are rejected for the same reasons.

2. **Claims 1-7, 9, 12-19, 28-34, 55-61, 82-88, 36, 63, 90, 39-46, 66-73 and 93-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Burg et al. (US Patent 6,134,319).**

Claim 1 is limited to a *method of processing phone numbers*. Burg discloses an apparatus and method for dialing out of local area telephone calls. See Abstract. The system as seen in figure 1 includes a data network (200) and an associated database (250). In one embodiment, the system allows a user of PC (100) to input a telephone number into the data network (200), at which point it becomes a *stored number*. The input telephone number is composed of a plurality of components, at least a local and possibly out-of-area access code section. See column 2, lines 23-59. The network scans the local and out-of-area sections to determine if the number is consistent with provided geographic information regarding the destination as provided by the user of the PC. The network performs updating to *correct* the number if any inconsistencies are discovered during the scanning, i.e. *parsing*. After *scanning and correction*, the stored number is made accessible to the user of the PC for subsequent dialing, thus, *correction occurs prior to selecting a stored phone number to dial*. See column 8, lines 53-67. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 28, 55, and 82 are essentially the same as claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 2 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. Burg discloses receiving an entire phone number and analyzing all possible international and national access codes, which inherently include international/national prefix codes as well as country/area codes. See column 2, lines 23-59. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 29, 56, and 83 are essentially the same as claim 2, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 3 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. Burg discloses that a stored number is enabled for subsequent dialing after correction. Thus, a calling party can quickly access the corrected number without entering the number and correcting it again; i.e. *selecting at least one of the one or more stored phone numbers to dial*. See column 8, lines 53-67. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 30, 57, and 84 are essentially the same as claim 3, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 4 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. Burg discloses that a number entered by a user is stored for processing and is scanned for inconsistencies with the location of the intended destination. See column 6, lines 22-40. Without the proper access codes, the number entered by the user is *undialable*, thus, adding the codes makes it *dialable*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 31, 58, and 85 are essentially the same as claim 4, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 5 is limited to *the method of claim 4*, as covered by Burg. The system disclosed by Burg is capable of adding international access codes to enable an international call. See column 4, lines 16-42. It is inherent that these codes include an *international prefix*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 32, 59, and 86 are essentially the same as claim 5, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 6 is limited to *the method of claim 4*, as covered by Burg. The system disclosed by Burg is capable of adding national access codes to enable a long-distance national call. See column 4, line 57 through column 5, line 7. It is inherent that these codes include a *national prefix*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 33, 60, and 87 are essentially the same as claim 6, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 7 is limited to *the method of claim 4*, as covered by Burg. The system disclosed by Burg is capable of adding international access codes to enable an international call. See column 4, lines 16-42. It is inherent that these codes include a *country code*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 34, 61, and 88 are essentially the same as claim 7, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 9 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. The system of Burg allows a user to enter either an incomplete or a complete telephone number,

including prefix access codes. If an incomplete number is entered, prefix codes are appended. See column 2, lines 22-43. If a complete number is entered, the entered prefix codes are verified for correctness. See column 2, lines 45-51. The determination that an incomplete number was entered and the verification of a complete number both correspond to *identifying one or more invalid phone numbers.*

Claims 36, 63, and 90 are essentially the same as claim 9, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 12 is limited to *the method of claim 9*, as covered by Burg. In column 8, lines 39-44, Burg discloses that the system can detect extraneous access codes, and remove them before subsequently storing the number in a database, i.e. *identifying one stored phone number as having too many digits.* Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 39, 66, and 93 are essentially the same as claim 12, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 13 is limited to *the method of claim 9*, as covered by Burg. In column 5, lines 22-40, Burg discloses that the system detects an incomplete number, and appends the required prefix codes necessary to complete a call to the intended destination, i.e. *identifying one stored phone number as having too few digits.* Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 40, 67, and 94 are essentially the same as claim 13, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 14 is limited to *the method of claim 9*, as covered by Burg. In column 5, lines 22-40, Burg discloses that the system detects an incomplete number, and appends the required prefix codes necessary to complete a call to the intended destination, i.e. *identifying one stored phone number as missing one or more phone number components*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 41, 68, and 95 are essentially the same as claim 14, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 15 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. In column 4, lines 16-42, Burg discloses that the system detects an incomplete number, and appends the required prefix codes necessary to complete a call to the intended destination, including international prefix codes, which inherently include *country codes*; i.e. *determining one or more country codes missing from one or more phone numbers of the one or more stored phone numbers*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 42, 69, and 96 are essentially the same as claim 15, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 16 is limited to *the method of claim 15*, as covered by Burg. In determining the proper international prefix to append to an incomplete telephone number, Burg discloses that the calling party enters information related to the incomplete telephone number. In particular, a calling party enters the destination country and region therein of the incomplete telephone number. See column 4, lines

16-42. This inherently provides the country of a customer portal. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 43, 70, and 97 are essentially the same as claim 16, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 17 is limited to *the method of claim 16*, as covered by Burg. In determining the proper international prefix to append to an incomplete telephone number, Burg discloses that the calling party enters information related to the incomplete telephone number. In particular, a calling party enters the destination country and region therein of the incomplete telephone number. See column 4, lines 16-42. The entered country and region correspond to *contact data associated with the one or more phone numbers missing one or more country codes*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 44, 71, and 98 are essentially the same as claim 17, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 18 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Burg. In column 4, lines 57 through column 5, line 8, Burg discloses that the system detects an incomplete number, and appends the required prefix codes necessary to complete a call to the intended destination, including national prefix codes, which inherently include area codes; i.e. *determining one or more area codes missing from one or more phone numbers of the one or more stored phone numbers*. Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 45, 72, and 99 are essentially the same as claim 18, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 19 is limited to *the method of claim 18*, as covered by Burg. In determining the proper national prefix to append to an incomplete telephone number, Burg discloses that the calling party enters information related to the incomplete telephone number. In particular, a calling party enters the destination state and city therein of the incomplete telephone number. See column 4, line 57, through column 5, line 8. The entered state and city correspond to *contact data associated with the one or more stored phone numbers missing one or more area codes*; and because this information produces an area code, it enables *reverse lookups* within the database (250). Therefore, Burg anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 46, 73, and 100 are essentially the same as claim 19, and are rejected for the same reasons.

3. **Claims 1, 9, 10, 28, 36, 37, 55, 63, 64, 82, 90 and 91** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Vander Meiden (US Patent 6,553,116).

Claim 1 is limited to *a method of processing phone numbers*. Vander Meiden discloses a system and method for early detection of area code changes. See Abstract. A dialed number, preferably stored in a speed dial list, is transmitted to a network (500) from telecommunication equipment (502) as in step 1002 of figure 5. The outgoing number is stored and subsequently compared with a connected party number transmitted from the network (500) upon completion of the outgoing call. The area codes are compared in step 1008 of figure 5, which inherently comprises *parsing*.

Based on the comparison, an area code change is indicated as seen in step 1018 of figure 5, which corresponds to *attempting to correct*. Since the indication of a pending area code change is indicated in step 1018, it occurs prior to the phone number, stored in a speed dial list, being dialed a second time. Therefore, Vander Meiden anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 28, 55, and 82 are essentially the same as claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 9 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Vander Meiden. As seen in figure 5, step 1010, an invalid telephone number is *identified* from the comparison in step 1008. Therefore, Vander Meiden anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 36, 63, and 90 are essentially the same as claim 9, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 10 is limited to *the method of claim 9*, as covered by Vander Meiden. In step 1018 of figure 5, the user or PBX administrator is notified of the invalid phone number. The PBX administrator corresponds to a *call center*. Therefore, Vander Meiden anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 37, 64, and 91 are essentially the same as claim 10, and are rejected for the same reasons.

4. **Claims 1, 20-22, 25, 28, 47-49, 52, 55, 74-76, 79, 82, 101-103 and 106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Nixon et al. (US Patent 5,475,743).**

Claim 1 is limited to a *method of processing phone numbers*. Nixon discloses a system and method for processing telephone numbers. See Abstract. As seen from figures 5A and 5B, a number input from phonebook (18), i.e. *stored*, is parsed in steps (306), (310), (314), (330), (334), and (344). See column 2, lines 54-60. Based on these parsing steps, the number is expanded to canonical form, i.e. *attempted to correct*. The input number is generated from a calling list, which means the number is stored. Also, the expanded input number is not dialed until the user decides it is the correct expanded form of the input number, i.e. *attempting to correct...prior to selecting...the stored phone number[s] to dial*. See column 17, lines 37-59. Therefore, Nixon anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 28, 55, and 82 are essentially the same as claim 1, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 20 is limited to *the method of claim 1*, as covered by Nixon. As seen in column 17, line 65, through column 18, line 7, the system of Nixon expands a non-canonical telephone number into its *canonical* form. Therefore, Nixon anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 47, 74, and 101 are essentially the same as claim 20, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 21 is limited to *the method of claim 20*, as covered by Nixon. Nixon discloses that the canonical form depends on the *country* of destination. See column 17, lines 65-67. Therefore, Nixon anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 48, 75, and 102 are essentially the same as claim 21, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 22 is limited to *the method of claim 22*, as covered by Nixon. Nixon discloses that the canonical form depends on the country of destination, i.e. *geography*. See column 17, lines 65-67. Therefore, Nixon anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 49, 76, and 103 are essentially the same as claim 22, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 25 is limited to *the method of claim 20*, as covered by Nixon. Nixon discloses that the canonical form depends on the country of destination and its associated dialing rules. For example, the NANP requires ten digits after the country code, i.e. *depends on a number of digits following a country code*. See column 17, lines 65-67. Therefore, Nixon anticipates all limitations of the claim.

Claims 52, 79, and 106 are essentially the same as claim 25, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 11, 38, 65 and 92 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vander Meiden (US Patent 6,553,116).**

Claim 11 is limited to *the method of claim 9*, as covered by Vander Meiden. In step 1018 of figure 5, the user or PBX administrator is notified of the invalid phone number. The user corresponds to a *phone user*. However, Vander Meiden doesn't expressly indicate that the communication device (502) of figure 1 is a mobile phone. Therefore, Vander Meiden anticipates all limitations of the claim with the exception of notifying a mobile phone user of the one or more invalid phone numbers.

The examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that mobile telephones were well known at the time of the invention. Because the system of Vander Meiden is not limited to the type of terminal device, it follows that any type of device could have been used as the originating device (502) of figure 1. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a mobile telephone as the originating device as was known in the prior art so an originating user can communicate remotely.

Claims 38, 65, and 92 are essentially the same as claim 11, and are rejected for the same reasons.

6. **Claims 23, 24, 50, 51, 77, 78, 104 and 105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nixon et al. (US Patent 5,475,743) in view of the online article “Phoning to and From Italy, located at <http://www.slowtrav.com/italy/instructions/phones.htm>).**

Claim 23 is limited to *the method of claim 20*, as covered by Nixon. Nixon discloses expanding an input telephone number based on its country's dialing rules. Nixon suggests that even portable phone numbers can be expanded. See column 3, lines 33-44. However, the system of Nixon does not teach adjusting the canonical form *whether the input telephone number is associated with mobile telephony*.

The examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that canonical telephone numbers for certain countries varied based on whether the number is associated with mobile or landline telephony at the time of the invention. Italy, for example requires each mobile phone number to begin with the number three, followed by its associated city code; evidence of this is provided by the online article "Phoning to and From Italy" located at <http://www.slowtrav.com/italy/instructions/phones.htm>. Specifically, the article indicates that since March 01, 2001, all mobile numbers in Italy were assigned a prefix to distinguish them from landlines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand an input telephone number dependent on whether it was associated with mobile telephony in order to distinguish them from landline telephone numbers.

Claims 50, 77, and 104 are essentially the same as claim 23, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Claim 24 is limited to *the method of claim 20*, as covered by Nixon. Nixon discloses expanding an input telephone number based on its country's dialing rules. Nixon suggests that even portable phone numbers can be expanded. See column 3, lines 33-44. However, the system of Nixon does not teach adjusting the canonical form *whether the input telephone number is associated with landline telephony*.

The examiner takes Official Notice of the fact that canonical telephone numbers for certain countries varied based on whether the number is associated with mobile or landline telephony at the time of the invention. Italy, for example requires each mobile phone number to begin with the number three, followed by its associated city code;

Art Unit: 2644

evidence of this is provided by the online article "Phoning to and From Italy" located at <http://www.slowtrav.com/italy/instructions/phones.htm>. Specifically, the article indicates that since March 01, 2001, all mobile numbers in Italy were assigned a prefix to distinguish them from landlines.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to expand an input telephone number dependent on whether it was associated with landline telephony in order to distinguish them from mobile telephone numbers.

Claims 51, 78, and 105 are essentially the same as claim 24, and are rejected for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Walter F Briney III whose telephone number is 571-272-7513. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh Tran can be reached on 571-272-7564. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WFB
5/2/05



SINH TRAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER